

Almost Tight Bounds for Conflict-Free Chromatic Guarding of Orthogonal Art Galleries

Frank Hoffmann¹, Klaus Kriegel¹, and Max Willert¹

¹ Freie Universität Berlin, Institut für Informatik, 14195 Berlin, Germany
 {hoffmann,kriegel,willerma}@mi.fu-berlin.de

Abstract

We address recently proposed chromatic versions of the classic Art Gallery Problem. Assume a simple polygon P is guarded by a finite set of point guards and each guard is assigned one of t colors. Such a chromatic guarding is said to be conflict-free if each point $p \in P$ sees at least one guard with a unique color among all guards visible from p . The goal is to establish bounds on the function $\chi_{cf}(n)$ of the number of colors sufficient to guarantee the existence of a conflict-free chromatic guarding for any n -vertex polygon.

Bärttschi and Suri showed $\chi_{cf}(n) \in O(\log n)$ (Algorithmica, 2014) for simple orthogonal polygons and the same bound applies to general simple polygons (Bärttschi et al., SoCG 2014). In this paper, we assume the r-visibility model instead of standard line visibility. Points p and q in an orthogonal polygon are r-visible to each other if the rectangle spanned by the points is contained in P . For this model we show $\chi_{cf}(n) \in O(\log \log n)$ and $\chi_{cf}(n) \in \Omega(\log \log n / \log \log \log n)$. Most interestingly, we can show that the lower bound proof extends to guards with line visibility. To this end we introduce and utilize a novel discrete combinatorial structure called multicolor tableau. This is the first non-trivial lower bound for this problem setting.

Furthermore, for the strong chromatic version of the problem, where all guards r-visible from a point must have distinct colors, we prove a $\Theta(\log n)$ -bound. Our results can be interpreted as coloring results for special geometric hypergraphs.

1998 ACM Subject Classification F.2.2 Nonnumerical Algorithms, G.2.2 Graph Theory

Keywords and phrases Orthogonal polygons, art gallery problem, hypergraph coloring

1 Introduction

The classic Art Gallery Problem (AGP) posed by Klee in 1973 asks for the minimum number of guards sufficient to watch an art gallery modelled by an n -sided simple polygon P . A guard sees a point in P if the connecting line segment is contained in P . Therefore, a guard watches a star polygon contained in P and the question is to cover P by a collection of stars with smallest possible cardinality. The answer is $\lfloor \frac{n}{3} \rfloor$ as shown by Chvátal, [3]. This result was the starting point for a rich body of research about algorithms, complexity and combinatorial aspects for many variants of the original question. Surveys can be found in the seminal monograph by O'Rourke [9], in Shermer [11] or Urrutia [13].


Graph coloring arguments have been frequently used for proving worst case combinatorial bounds for art gallery type questions starting with Fisk's proof [5]. Somehow surprisingly, chromatic versions of the AGP have been proposed and studied only recently. There are two chromatic variants: strong and conflict-free chromatic guarding of a polygon P . In both versions we look for a guard set G and give each guard one of t colors. The chromatic guarding is said to be strong if for each point $p \in P$ all guards $G(p)$ that see p have pairwise different colors [4]. It is conflict-free if in each $G(p)$ there is at least one guard with a unique color, see [1]. The goal is to determine guard sets such that the number of colors sufficient



© Frank Hoffmann, Klaus Kriegel, and Max Willert;
 licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY

Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany



■ **Figure 1** Example of conflict-free (left) and strong chromatic (right) r-guarding

for these purposes is minimal. Observe, in both versions minimizing the number of guards is not part of the objective function. Figure 1 shows a simple orthogonal polygon with both conflict-free and strong chromatic guardings in the r-visibility model. To grasp the nature of the problem, observe that it has two conflicting aspects. We have to guard the polygon but at the same time we want the guards to hide from each other, since then we can give them the same color. For example, in the strong version we want a guard set that can be partitioned into a minimal number of subsets and in each subset the pairwise link distance is at least 3. Moreover, we will see a strong dependence of the results on the underlying visibility model, l-visibility vs. r-visibility. We use superscripts l and r in the bounds to indicate the model.

Let $\chi_{st}^l(n)$ and $\chi_{cf}^l(n)$ denote the minimal number of colors sufficient for any simple polygon on n vertices in the strong chromatic and in the conflict-free version if based on line visibility.

Here is a short summary of known bounds. For simple orthogonal polygons on n vertices $\chi_{cf}^l(n) \in O(\log n)$, as shown in [1]. The same bound applies to simple general polygons, see [2]. Both proofs are based on subdividing the polygon into weak visibility subpolygons that are in a certain sense independent with respect to cf-chromatic guarding.

For the strong chromatic version we have $\chi_{st}^l(n) \in \Theta(n)$ for simple polygons and $\chi_{st}^l(n) \in \Omega(\sqrt{n})$ even for the monotone orthogonal case, see [4]. NP-hardness is discussed in [6]. In [4], simple $O(1)$ upper bounds are shown for special polygon classes like spiral polygons and orthogonal staircase polygons combined with line visibility.

Next we state our main contributions for simple orthogonal polygons:

1. We show $\chi_{cf}^r(n) \in O(\log \log n)$ and $\chi_{cf}^r(n) \in \Omega(\log \log n / \log \log \log n)$.
2. The lower bound holds for line visibility, too: $\chi_{cf}^l(n) \in \Omega(\log \log n / \log \log \log n)$. This is the first super-constant lower bound for this problem.
3. For the strong chromatic version we have $\chi_{st}^r(n) \in \Theta(\log n)$.

The chromatic AGP versions can be easily interpreted as hypergraph coloring questions. Smorodinsky [12] gives a nice survey of both practical and theoretical aspects of hypergraph coloring. A special role play hypergraphs that arise in geometry. For example, given a set of points P in the plane and a set of regions $\mathcal{R}$ like rectangles, disks etc. we can define the hypergraph $H_{\mathcal{R}}(P) = (P, \{P \cap S \mid S \in \mathcal{R}\})$. The discrete interval hypergraph $H_{\mathcal{I}}$ is a concrete example of such a hypergraph: We take n points on a line and all possible intervals as regions. It is not difficult to see that $\chi_{cf}(H_{\mathcal{I}}) \in \Theta(\log n)$. As to our AGP versions, we can associate with a given polygon and a guard set a geometric hypergraph. Its vertices are the guards and a hyperedge is defined by a set of guards that have a nonempty common intersection of their visibility regions and in the intersection there is a point that sees exactly these guards. Then one wants to color this graph in a conflict-free or in a strong manner. Another example is the following rectangle hypergraph. Vertex set is a finite set of n axis-aligned rectangles and each maximal subset of rectangles with a common intersection forms

a hyperedge. Here the order for the cf-chromatic number is $\Omega(\log n)$ and $O(\log^2 n)$ as shown in [12, 10].

Looking at our results, it is not a big surprise that the combination of orthogonal polygons with r-visibility yields the strongest bounds. This is simply due to additional structural properties and this phenomenon has already been observed for the original AGP. For example, the $\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor$ tight worst case bound for covering simple orthogonal polygons with general stars can also be proven for r-stars (see [9]) and it holds even for orthogonal polygons with holes, see ([7]). Further, while minimizing the number of guards is NP-hard both for simple general and orthogonal polygons if based on line visibility, it becomes polynomially solvable for r-visibility in the simple orthogonal case, see [8, 15]. The latter result is based on the solution of the strong perfect graph conjecture.

The paper is organized as follows. We give necessary basic definitions in the next section. Then we prove upper bounds in Section 3 using techniques developed in [1, 2]. Our main contribution are the lower bound proofs in Section 4. Especially, we introduce a novel combinatorial structure called multicolor tableau. This structure enables us to extend the lower bound proof for r-visibility to the line visibility model.

Omitted proofs can be found in the Appendix.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Orthogonal polygons, r-visibility and general position assumption

We study simple orthogonal polygons, i.e., polygons consisting of alternating vertical and horizontal edges only that do not have holes. By $|P|$ we denote the number of vertices, by ∂P the boundary and by $\text{int}P = P \setminus \partial P$ the interior of the polygon. Vertices can be reflex or convex. A reflex vertex has an interior angle $3\pi/2$ while convex vertices have an interior angle of $\pi/2$. To simplify the presentation we make the following very weak assumption about general position of orthogonal polygons: If two reflex vertices $p, q \in P$ are connected in $\text{int}P$ by a horizontal/vertical chord then the four rays emanating from p and q towards the interior along the incident edges represent only 3 of the 4 main compass directions. That is, two rays are opposite to each other and the other two point in the same direction.

Points $p, q \in P$ are line visible (or l-visible for short) to each other if the line segment pq is contained in P . Observe that the segment pq is allowed to contain parts of boundary edges. The points p, q are r-visible to each other if the closed axis-parallel rectangle $R[p, q]$ spanned by the points is contained in P . For $p \in P$ we denote by $V_P^l(p) = \{q \in P \mid pq \subset P\}$ and $V_P^r(p) = \{q \in P \mid R[p, q] \subseteq P\}$ the set of all points l-visible from p and r-visibility, respectively. This is also called the visibility polygon of a point $p \in P$. If it is clear from the context which polygon is meant we omit the index. A polygon that is fully visible from one of its points is called a star and, again, we have to distinguish between l-stars and r-stars. Most notably, for a point p in an orthogonal polygon the visibility polygon $V^r(p)$ is itself orthogonal while $V^l(p)$ usually is not. We can generalize this by defining for a subpolygon $P' \subset P$ its visibility polygon by $V^r(P') = \cup_{p \in P'} V^r(p)$. The windows of a subpolygon P' in P are those parts of $\partial P'$ that do not belong to ∂P .

For an orthogonal polygon P we define its induced r-visibility line arrangement $A^r(P)$. Two points $p, q \in P$ are equivalent with respect to r-visibility if $V^r(p) = V^r(q)$. This is an equivalence relation. What are the equivalence classes? First of all, there is a simple geometric construction to find $A^r(P)$. For each reflex vertex of P we extend both incident boundary edges into $\text{int}P$ until they meet the boundary again, therefore defining a subdivision of the polygon. The faces of this line arrangement are rectangles, line segments, and intersection

points. Clearly, two points from the interior of the same rectangle define the same r-star. What about line segments in the arrangement? We extend a line segment l into both directions until we hit a convex vertex or the interior of a boundary edge. Let's call this extension l^+ . By our general position assumption we know that on one side (*inner* side) of l^+ there is only polygon interior. Consider a point p in the interior of a line segment that is incident with two rectangular faces. It is not difficult to see, that p inherits the r-visibility from the incident rectangle on its inner side and the same rule applies to intersection points which can have up to four incident rectangles.

Finally, we define special classes of orthogonal polygons. A weak r-visibility polygon (also known as histogram) has a boundary edge e (called base edge) connecting two convex vertices such that $V_P^r(e) = P$. This is therefore a monotone polygon with respect to the orientation of e . A weak r-visibility polygon that is an r-star is called a *pyramid*.

2.2 Conflict-free and strong chromatic guarding

A set G of points is an r-guard set for an orthogonal polygon P if their r-visibility polygons jointly cover the whole polygon. That is: $V^r(G) = \cup_{g \in G} V^r(g) = P$, analogously for l-visibility. If in addition each guard $g \in G$ is assigned one color $\gamma(g)$ from a fixed finite set of colors $[t] = \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ we have a chromatic guarding (G, γ) . Next we give the central definition of this paper.

► **Definition 2.1.** A chromatic r-guard set (G, γ) for P is strong if for any two guards $g, g' \in G$ we have $V^r(g) \cap V^r(g') \neq \emptyset$ implies $\gamma(g) \neq \gamma(g')$.

A chromatic r-guard set (G, γ) is conflict-free if for any point $p \in P$ in the guard set $G(p) = V^r(p) \cap G$ there is at least one guard with a unique color.

We denote by $\chi_{cf}^r(P)$ the minimal t such that there is conflict-free chromatic guarding set for P using t colors. Maximizing this value over all polygons with n vertices from a specified polygon class is denoted by $\chi_{cf}^r(n)$.

Consequently, we denote by $\chi_{st}^r(P)$ the minimal t such that there is strong chromatic guarding set using t colors. Maximizing this value for all polygons with n vertices from a specified polygon class defines the value $\chi_{st}^r(n)$.

The notions for line visibility are completely analogous and use superscript l .


3 Upper Bounds

We show upper bounds for both strong and conflict-free r-guarding of simple orthogonal polygons of size n : $\chi_{st}^r(n) \in O(\log n)$ and $\chi_{cf}^r(n) \in O(\log \log n)$. These bounds are even realized by r-guards placed in the interior of visibility cells. This restriction will simplify the arguments. The proof (see also [14]) follows closely ideas developed in [2, 1] for conflict-free l-guarding of simple polygons. Therefore we only recall the general ideas, omit some proof details and emphasize the differences stemming from the underlying r-visibility.

3.1 Partition into independent weak visibility polygons

First of all, we reuse the central concept of *independence* introduced in [1, 2] for line visibility. Independence means that one can use the same color sets for coloring guards in independent subpolygons. The following definition suffices for our purposes.

► **Definition 3.1.** Let P be a simple orthogonal polygon and P_1 and P_2 subpolygons of P . We call P_1 and P_2 independent if $V^r(\text{int}P_1) \cap V^r(\text{int}P_2) = \emptyset$.



■ **Figure 2** The partitioning process and the corresponding schematic tree.

Next, we are going to subdivide hierarchically an orthogonal polygon P into weak visibility subpolygons by a standard window partitioning process as described in [1].

Remark: In the following we use the term subdivision not in the strong set-theoretic sense. A subdivision of P into closed subpolygons $P_1, \dots, P_k$ means that $P = \bigcup_{i=1}^k P_i$ and for all $i \neq j$ we have $\text{int}P_i \cap \text{int}P_j = \emptyset$.

The subdivision is represented by a tree $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_P(e)$ with the weak visibility polygons as node set. Let e be a highest horizontal edge of ∂P , the “starting” window. $Q = V^r(e)$ is a weak visibility polygon and is the root vertex of $\mathcal{T}$. Now Q splits P into parts and defines a finite set (possibly empty if $Q = P$) of vertical windows $w_1, \dots, w_k$. Each window corresponds to a left or right turn of a shortest orthogonal path from e to the subpolygon lying entirely behind the window. Then we recurse, see Figure 2.

By the partitioning process we can obtain a linear number of subpolygons only. There are $\frac{n-4}{2}$ reflex vertices in a simple orthogonal polygon with n vertices. Each window uses at least one reflex vertex. Therefore, we get at most $n/2 - 1$ weak visibility polygons. This bound is realized for example by spiral polygons.


Let $\mathcal{A}_d, d = 0, 1, 2$ be the family of all weak visibility polygons corresponding to nodes of depth congruent $d \bmod 3$ in $\mathcal{T}$. We partition $\mathcal{A}_d$ into $\mathcal{A}_d^L$ consisting of Q and all those subpolygons which are left children and, on the other side, $\mathcal{A}_d^R$ consisting of the remaining “right” parts.

► **Lemma 3.2.** *Let P be a polygon and $\mathcal{A}_d^L, d = 0, 1, 2$ the family of subpolygons corresponding to left nodes in $\mathcal{T}$ with depth congruent $d \bmod 3$. Then the interior of subpolygons in $\mathcal{A}_d^L$ have pairwise link distance at least three, analogously for $\mathcal{A}_d^R$.*

Proof. Suppose there are two different subpolygons P_1 and P_2 in $\mathcal{A}_d^L$. If they have different depth then for arbitrary points $p_1 \in \text{int}P_1$ and $p_2 \in \text{int}P_2$ any orthogonal path connecting these points has length at least 3. Otherwise they have the same depth. In this case they could be sibling nodes with parent node P_0 . To walk orthogonally from p_1 to p_2 it needs two parallel edges to cross the windows plus one more edge in P_0 . If the lowest common ancestor P_0 is more than 1 level above then a shortest orthogonal path from p_1 to p_2 has to visit the parent node of P_1 , the parent node of P_2 and then descend to p_2 which takes at least three edges. ◀

Observe that distinguishing left and right nodes is essential. It can be possible to walk with one step from a left node to a right sibling.

► **Corollary 3.3.** *Let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{A}_d^L$ be subpolygons computed in the subdivision process for P . Then P_1 and P_2 are independent and there exists a strong chromatic r -guarding for P in which guards in P_1 and P_2 use the same color set. The same is true for conflict-free chromatic guarding.*



■ **Figure 3** The truncation process of a weak visibility polygon and its schematic tree with guard positions

Proof. Assume we have r -guards p_i in $\text{int}P_i$, $i = 1, 2$ with $V^r(p_1) \cap V^r(p_2)$ containing a point q . Then there exist points $p'_1 \in R[p_1, q] \cap (\text{int}P_1)$, $p'_2 \in R[p_2, q] \cap (\text{int}P_2)$ and a connecting orthogonal path $p'_1 - q - p'_2$ of length 2. But this contradicts the previous lemma. Therefore P_1 and P_2 are independent and strong chromatic r -guardings for P_1 and P_2 do not interfere with each other, the same holds for conflict-free r -guardings. ◀

Remark: We will restrict the guards to sit in the interior of visibility cells. However, this does not effect the asymptotic upper bounds on the number of colors used.

3.2 Guarding a weak visibility polygon


Consider a weak visibility polygon P with a horizontal base edge e . An edge of P opposite to e is an r -edge if it connects two reflex vertices, it is a c -edge if it has two convex vertices. Among the horizontal edges opposite to e there is at least one c -edge and a chain connecting two consecutive c -edges contains exactly one r edge. Recall that a pyramid P contains exactly one c -edge e_1 . We guard a pyramid with one r -guard stationed opposite to e_1 in the visibility cell just below base edge e . Next we describe (see [1]) a simple truncation process that decomposes a weak visibility problem into pyramids.

The truncation process: Let P be a weak visibility polygon with n vertices, a horizontal base edge e on top of the polygon and C the set of c -edges opposite to e . If there is only one such c -edge we stop and return P . Otherwise, for each c -edge e' we sweep P from e' towards e until the sweep line reaches the first neighboring r -edge. We truncate P by cutting of the pyramid below. After processing all edges in C we have again a weak visibility polygon $P^{(1)}$ with base edge e . Observe that $P^{(1)}$ does not depend on the order in which we process the edges in C and, moreover, the pyramids associated with C are independent. Then we iterate with $P^{(1)}$ and get $P^{(2)}$ and so on. Eventually, we have indeed partitioned P completely into pyramids. These pyramids have an important structural property. By construction, the unique c -edge in each pyramid contains a non-empty segment of the original boundary ∂P , we call them “solid” segments. As guard position for such a pyramid we choose an interior point just below the base edge of the pyramid opposite to an interior point of a solid segment.

In Figure 3 we see an example of a weak visibility polygon, its decomposition into pyramids and the chosen guard positions. Again, there is a canonical schematic tree representing the decomposition and the guard positions.

Clearly, the height of $T_P, |P| = n$ is in $O(\log n)$. In the worst case, this is best possible as shown by the spike polygons S_m in Section 4 we use for our lower bound proofs.

The following lemma states the main structural property for this tree of guards.



■ **Figure 4** Single points are seen by connected chains of r-guards

► **Lemma 3.4.** *Let P be a weak visibility polygon and T_P the guard-tree computed in the truncation process. Then for each $p \in P$ all guards in $G(p)$ form a connected subpath of a root-to-leaf path in T_P .*

Proof. Assume two nodes representing pyramids P_1 and P_2 are not on a root to leaf path in T_P . Consider the lowest common ancestor node, say it is pyramid P_0 . P_0 has a solid segment in its c-edge. Therefore P_1 and P_2 are independent and r-guards from both pyramids cannot see the same point p . Now we know that all r-guards watching a common point p are indeed on a common root-to-leaf path. Let g_l be the deepest and g_h the highest guard among them with $g_h \neq g_l$. We have to show, that all guards in between see point p , too. Where can point p be? It has to be in the vertical strip above the base line of the pyramid with guard g_l and below the base line of the pyramid corresponding to g_h , since the parent node of g_h does not see p by assumption. This region is a rectangle R . For any guard g between g_l and g_h the vertical strip above the corresponding base line contains R and g sees p . ◀

In Figure 4 the paths formed by r-guards watching point p and for point q are indicated.

► **Theorem 3.5.** *Let P be an orthogonal polygon with $|P| = n$. We have $\chi_{st}^r(P) \in O(\log n)$.*

Proof. We decompose P into pairwise independent weak visibility polygons. Each weak visibility polygon can be further decomposed into pyramids and the corresponding guard trees have height $O(\log n)$. We color each guard by its depth in the tree. This is a strong chromatic guarding since for each $p \in P$ by Lemma 3.4 all of its guards have pairwise different colors. ◀


We use the same r-guard positions but a different coloring scheme to get a conflict-free coloring. Consider the color alphabet $[m] = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and the following recursively defined set of words. Let $s_1 = 1$ and $s_i = s_{i-1} \circ i \circ s_{i-1}$. The following is straightforward and has been used before for conflict-free coloring the discrete interval hypergraph.

► **Lemma 3.6.** *A prefix of s_m with length k has no more than $\lceil \log(k+1) \rceil$ different colors and each connected subword contains a unique color.*


► **Theorem 3.7.** *Let P be an orthogonal polygon with $|P| = n$. Then $\chi_{cf}^r(P) \in O(\log \log n)$.*

Proof. The only difference in comparison with the proof above is the coloring scheme. Each r-guard tree gets colored top-down with the sequence s_m of length at most height of the tree, that is $O(\log n)$. By Lemma 3.6 the color alphabet needs to be of size $O(\log \log n)$ and the coloring is conflict-free by Lemma 3.4. ◀

We illustrate the construction in Figure 5.



■ **Figure 5** Strong (left) and conflict-free guarding (right) of a weak visibility polygon



■ **Figure 6** Spike polygons S_1 and S_2 (left), left wing and right wing of column $k = 6$ in S_3 (middle), blocks and subblocks (right)

4 Lower Bounds

4.1 Spike polygons

All lower bounds established in this paper are based on a simple, recursively defined family of so called spike polygons S_m , where S_1 is a simple square and S_{m+1} is formed by two copies of S_m separated by a vertical spike, but joined by an additional horizontal layer. The left side of Figure 6 illustrates this construction together with the subdivision of S_2 into visibility cells. Observe that the height sequence of the spikes in S_{m+1} is nothing else but the word s_m used in Theorem 3.7 above.

Columns of S_m are numbered left to right by indices $k \in [2^m - 1]$, and cells in column k top down by an additional index $i \in [d_m(k)]$ where $d_m(k)$ is the depth of column k in S_m . Formally, we have $d_m(k) = m - \pi_2(k)$ where $\pi_2(k)$ is the multiplicity of factor 2 in the prime decomposition of k . Obviously, a column has maximal depth m iff its index is odd.

We introduce the notions of the left and right wing of column k in order to distinguish guard positions: The left wing $W_L(k)$ is the set of all points strictly on the left side of the midline of column k and the right wing is the complement $W_R(k) = S_m \setminus W_L(k)$.

We will prove three lower bound results for guarding spike polygons. The easiest version refers to strong chromatic r -guardings.

► **Theorem 4.1.** *We have $\chi_{st}^r(S_t) \geq t$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction. The induction base for S_1 is straightforward. Next we show the induction step by contradiction. Assume that the claim is true for some S_t and suppose that there is a strong chromatic r -guarding of S_{t+1} with t colors only. There must be a unique color c_1 for the top cell in the middle column. Since the corresponding guard g_1 sees all cells in the first row, it is the only one of color c_1 in S_{t+1} (any other c_1 -guard would produce a conflict in at least one cell in the first row). The deletion of the top row splits the remaining part of S_{t+1} into two copies of S_t . Depending on the position of g_1 in S_{t+1} , at least in one copy no cell is r -visible from g_1 . Thus, we have a strong $(t - 1)$ -chromatic r -guarding of this copy. But this contradicts the induction hypothesis. ◀

The other two lower bound proofs are much more involved, but they follow the same scheme. They are by induction and the induction step is shown by contradiction. But now

the induction step can require a sequence of t steps cutting out from the original S_m smaller units until arriving at a contradiction. We start with the proof for cf-guardings with respect to r -visibility. In its quintessence it relies on purely combinatorial properties of a discrete structure which we call multicolor tableau. We will then rediscover a slightly weaker version of this structure having similar properties when discussing lower bounds for conflict-free guardings based on l -visibility for appropriately vertically stretched spike polygons.

4.2 Blocks and multicolor tableaux

Consider the spike polygon S_m . It has $N = 2^m - 1$ columns. We define the block $B(k)$ of column k as the interval of all neighbouring columns of depth at least $d(k)$, see Figure 6: $B(k) = [k - (2^{\pi_2(k)} - 1), k + (2^{\pi_2(k)} - 1)]$. Geometrically, a block is nothing but a smaller spike polygon. Deleting its central column a block splits into a left and a right subblock:

$$B_L(k) = [k - (2^{\pi_2(k)} - 1), k - 1] \quad B_R(k) = [k + 1, k + (2^{\pi_2(k)} - 1)]$$

For odd k we have $B(k) = \{k\}$ and $B_L(k) = B_R(k) = \emptyset$. Later it will be necessary to subdivide a left or right subblock again into its left and right subblocks. These “quarter”-subblocks can be described making use of the definition above together with the central column $l(k) = k - 2^{\pi_2(k)-1}$ in block $B_L(k)$ and column $r(k) = k + 2^{\pi_2(k)-1}$ in block $B_R(k)$:

$$B_{LL}(k) = B_L(l(k)) \quad B_{LR}(k) = B_R(l(k)) \quad B_{RL}(k) = B_L(r(k)) \quad B_{RR}(k) = B_R(r(k)).$$

Let G be a finite set of r -guards covering S_m and $\gamma : G \rightarrow [t]$ a cf-coloring of G . By $M_{i,k}$ we denote the multiset of all colors of guards that see the i th visibility cell $R_{i,k}$ in column k , and let $m_{i,k}(c)$ denote the multiplicity of color c in $M_{i,k}$. Then the combinatorial scheme $\mathcal{M}(\gamma) := (M_{i,k} \mid 1 \leq k \leq N, 1 \leq i \leq d_m(k))$ will be called a conflict-free multicolor tableau. We formally define the set of unique colors of a cell by $U_{i,k} := \{c \in [t] \mid m_{i,k}(c) = 1\}$ and the standard inclusion relation $M_{i,k} \subseteq M_{j,l}$ for multisets by: $\forall c \in [t] \quad m_{i,k}(c) \leq m_{j,l}(c)$.

The following simple fact about r -visibility in spike polygons makes the crucial difference between the simpler lower bound proof for r -visibility and the more involved proof for l -visibility.

► **Lemma 4.2.** *Let g be an r -guard in S_m that sees a cell $R_{i,k}$, then g is in a cell of depth $d \leq d_m(k)$ and it sees all cells $R_{i',j}$ with $i' \leq i$ and $j \in B(k)$.*

Proof. The first assertion is straightforward because otherwise the spike in column k would block the visibility between g and $R_{i,k}$. For the second claim consider the minimal rectangle R enclosing the cell of g and $R_{i,k}$. Since the lower side of R has depth $\leq d_m(k)$ and all columns $j \in B(k)$ have depth $\geq d_m(k)$ one can extend R within S_m horizontally to the whole width of the block $B(k)$ and upwards to the top edge of S_m . ◀

► **Lemma 4.3.** *Let G be an r -guard set covering S_m and $\gamma : G \rightarrow [t]$ a cf-coloring of G . Then for any color $c \in [t]$ and for any column in the multicolor tableau $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ the following holds: The multiplicity $m_{i,k}(c)$ is a monotonically decreasing function with respect to row index i . In particular, if c is a unique color somewhere in column k then row indices of cells with $m_{i,k}(c) = 1$ form an interval $[i_1, i_2]$ and $m_{i_2+1,k}(c) = 0$.*

► **Proposition 4.4.** *For a conflict-free r -guarding $\gamma : G \rightarrow [t]$ of S_m the multicolor tableau $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ has three combinatorial properties:*

1. *cf-Property:* $\forall k \in [N] \quad \forall i \in [d_m(k)] \quad U_{i,k} \neq \emptyset$.
2. *Monotonicity:* $\forall k \in [N] \quad \forall 1 \leq i < i' \leq d_m(k) \quad M_{i',k} \subseteq M_{i,k}$.

3. *Left-right rule: If c is a unique color in the top cell $R_{1,k}$ of column k then for all $j \in B_L(k)$ or for all $j \in B_R(k)$ the following three conditions hold*
- a. $c \in M_{1,j}$
 - b. If $c \in U_{1,j}$ then $c \notin M_{d_m(k)+1,j}$.
 - c. If $c \notin U_{1,j}$ then $c \notin U_{1,j'}$ for all $j' \in B(j)$.

Proof. There is nothing to prove for the cf-property and the monotonicity follows from Lemma 4.3. It remains to establish the left-right rule. Assume $c \in U_{1,k}$ and consider the corresponding guard g . Depending on whether g is in $W_R(k)$ or in $W_L(k)$ we prove that the three properties hold in the opposite block $B_L(k)$ or in $B_R(k)$, respectively. Again, it suffices to discuss the first case. By Lemma 4.2 g sees all cells $R_{1,j}$ with $j \in B(k)$. Condition (a) holds because $B_L(k) \subseteq B(k)$.

We prove condition (b) by contradiction assuming that $c \in U_{1,j}$ and $c \in M_{d_m(k)+1,j}$ for some $j \in B_L(k)$. Since g is in the right wing of k , it can't see any cell of depth $d_m(k) + 1$ in the left wing. Thus $c \in M_{d_m(k)+1,j}$ implies the existence of another c -colored guard g' , that sees $R_{d_m(k)+1,j}$. But again by Lemma 4.2 g' sees also $R_{1,j}$ what contradicts the uniqueness of c for this cell.

Finally, if c is not unique for $R_{1,j}$ then there are at least two guards with color c that watch $R_{1,j}$. Both of them watch all cells $R_{1,j'}$ with $j' \in B(j)$ what proves condition (c). ◀

► **Theorem 4.5.** *For simple orthogonal polygons $\chi_{cf}^r(n) \in \Omega\left(\frac{\log \log n}{\log \log \log n}\right)$.*

Proof. (Sketch) Let $m(t)$ be defined by $m(1) = 2$ and $m(t) = 1 + t \cdot m(t-1)$ for $t \geq 2$.

Claim: $\chi_{cf}^r(S_{m(t)}) > t$.

It is easy to deduce the theorem from the claim. A simple inductive argument shows $m(t) \leq (t+1)!$ and thus $\chi_{cf}^r(n) > t$ for some $n \leq 2^{(t+1)!+1}$, because this is an upper bound on the vertex number of $S_{m(t)}$. This inequality is equivalent to $\log n \leq (t+1)! + 1$ what implies $\log \log n \in O(t \log t)$ and, finally, $t \in \Omega\left(\frac{\log \log n}{\log \log \log n}\right)$.

We prove the claim by induction on t . For the base case $t = 1$ we must show that it is impossible to guard S_2 conflict free with one color. Suppose the opposite and consider the corresponding multicolor tableau $\mathcal{M} = (M_{1,1}, M_{1,2}, M_{1,3}, M_{2,1}, M_{2,3})$. The only way to fulfill the uniqueness condition is to set $M_{i,j} = U_{i,j} = \{1\}$ for all pairs (i, j) and color 1. This already contradicts condition (b) of the left-right rule applied to the situation $1 \in U_{1,2}$.


Next, we illustrate the induction step in detail for the step from $t = 1$ to $t = 2$ with $m(1) = 2$ and $m(2) = 5$. We prove it by contradiction. Suppose there is an r-guard set G and a coloring $\gamma : G \rightarrow [2]$ that is a conflict-free guarding of S_5 and let $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ be the corresponding multicolor tableau. A contradiction will be derived by a sequence of at most two cutting stages with the goal to identify a subpolygon S_2 in S_5 that has a conflict-free r-guarding with only one color.

We start with a unique color $c_1 \in [2]$ of the top cell $R_{1,16}$ in the central column $k_1 = 16$ of S_5 . W.l.o.g. the corresponding guard g_1 is located in the right wing $W_R(16)$ and the three conditions of the left-right rule apply for all $j \in B_L(16)$.


The subblocks $B(4)$ and $B(12)$ cover $B_L(16)$ with the exception of the separating column 8. Considering the two central top cells $R_{1,4}$ and $R_{1,12}$ (the green cells in Figure 7) we distinguish two cases:

- (1): $\forall_{j \in \{4,12\}} c_1 \in U_{1,j}$
- (2): $\exists_{j \in \{4,12\}} c_1 \notin U_{1,j}$

Whenever Case (1) occurs this is a stopping rule, because one can directly identify a subpolygon with the shape of S_2 together a conflict-free guarding that uses one color only, a



■ **Figure 7** The first subdivision stage in S_5 : Case 1 holds if c_1 is unique for both green cells, $j_1 = 4$ and $j_2 = 12$. Then P_1 would have a conflict-free r-guarding with only one color, a contradiction.



■ **Figure 8** Case 2 occurred in the first subdivision stage because of $c_1 \notin U_{1,k_2}$, $j_1 = 13$ and $j_2 = 15$. Then the next subdivision stage applies to block $B(k_2)$.

contradiction. To that end we construct the subpolygon P_1 consisting of all cells $R_{i,j}$ with $2 \leq i \leq 3$ and $j \in B_L(k_1)$, the grey shaded region in Figure 7. One can make two basic observations about P_1 :

- (i) The shapes of P_1 and S_2 are the same in the sense that P_1 is a stretched version of S_2 and their decompositions into r-visibility cells are isomorphic.
- (ii) Let G_1 be the set of all guards from G that are positioned in P_1 . We extend it to a set G_1^+ by pulling down all guards in cells above P_1 onto the top edge of P_1 . In Figure 7 this is illustrated by small downarrows. Then G_1^+ with the original coloring γ is a cf-guarding of P_1 with one color only because color c_1 does not occur.

The last assertion is straightforward because the presence of any c_1 -colored guard in G_1^+ would contradict the uniqueness of c_1 for $R_{1,4}$ or $R_{1,12}$ (the assumption of case 1). It is also clear that G_1^+ covers P_1 because any original guard for a cell $R_{i,4}$ with $i \geq 2$ remains in G_1^+ and it will cover all $R_{i,j}$ with $j \in B(4)$ as well. Finally the cf-condition also extends from a cell $R_{i,4}$ to all $R_{i,j}$ with $j \in B(4)$ because all columns in $B_L(4)$ and $B_R(4)$ are truncated from below at level 3. The argumentation applies to cells $R_{i,j}$ with $j \in B(12)$.

Observations (i) and (ii) together give a contradiction to the inductive assumption.

In contrast, the occurrence of case (2) invokes a second stage. Choose one index $j \in \{4, 12\}$ such that $c_1 \notin U_{1,j}$, set $k_2 = j$ and repeat the former procedure in the block $B(k_2)$. Remark, the left-right rule implies $c_1 \notin U_{1,j}$ for all $j \in B(k_2)$. Now the second color c_2 must be unique for cell R_{1,k_2} and the position of the corresponding guard g_2 implies that the three conditions of the left-right rule apply for all $j \in B_L(k_2)$ or for all $j \in B_R(k_2)$. Figure 8 illustrates the situation for $k_2 = 12$ and $g_2 \in W_L(12)$. Note, guard g_2 could sit also outside of block $B(12)$. The three conditions of the left-right rule apply for all $j \in B_R(12)$. Again, there are two subblocks $B(13)$ and $B(15)$ (now single columns) that cover $B_R(12)$ with exception of the separating column 14. The next case distinction refers to their top cells $R_{1,13}, R_{1,15}$:

- (1): $\forall_{j \in \{13,15\}} c_2 \in U_{1,j}$
- (2): $\exists_{j \in \{13,15\}} c_2 \notin U_{1,j}$

In Case (1) one can cut out the subpolygon P_2 consisting of all cells $R_{i,j}$ with $4 \leq i \leq 5$ and $j \in B_R(12)$, see Figure 8, and construct a guard set G_2^+ as in case 1 before. This would result in a cf-guarding of P_2 without c_2 , a contradiction.

In Case (2) there is a $j \in \{13, 15\}$ with $c_2 \notin U_{1,j}$, but moreover $c_1 \notin U_{1,j}$ because Case (2) occurred in the first stage. This implies $U_{1,j} = \emptyset$, a contradiction again.

Now we present the general induction step from $t - 1$ to t , again shown by contradiction.

Assume that there is no conflict-free r-guarding of $S_{m'}$ with $t - 1$ colors for $m' = m(t - 1)$, but there is an r-guard set G and a coloring $\gamma : G \rightarrow [t]$ that is a conflict-free guarding of S_m for $m = m(t)$. Again we make use of the corresponding multicolor tableau $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$.

A contradiction will be derived by a sequence of at most t cutting stages.

Stage s ($s \in [t]$) always starts with the precondition that there is a column $k_s \in [2^m - 1]$ of depth $d_m(k_s) = 1 + (s - 1)m'$, the block $B(k_s)$ of S_m with $N_s = 2^{m-(s-1)m'} - 1$ columns and a set $C_{s-1} \subseteq [t]$ of $s - 1$ colors such that $c \notin U_{1,j}$ for all $j \in B(k_s)$ and for all $c \in C_{s-1}$. The first stage starts with $k_1 = 2^{m-1}$ (the central column of S_m), $N_1 = 2^m - 1$, $C_0 = \emptyset$ and an empty precondition. Each stage results in a case distinction where the occurrence of the first case would finish the proof by a contradiction with the inductive assumption, whereas the second case implies the precondition of the next stage. Since the precondition of stage $t + 1$ states a contradiction of the form $U_{1,k_{t+1}} = \emptyset$ (because $C_t = [t]$ is the set of all colors), it won't be necessary to execute that stage.

Now, suppose that the precondition of a stage $s \leq t$ is fulfilled in a block $B(k_s)$ with the color set $C_{s-1} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{s-1}\}$. Choose some color $c_s \in U_{1,k_s} \neq \emptyset$ ($c_s \notin C_{s-1}$ by the precondition) and consider the corresponding guard g_s in the left or right wing of column k_s . By symmetry it is sufficient to discuss the first case $g_s \in W_L(k_s)$ where the three conditions of the left-right rule hold for all $j \in B_R(k_s)$. Let $J_s = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K\}$ be the set of all columns of depth $1 + sm'$ in $B_R(k_s)$. Note that this condition implies for all $j_l \in J_s$ that $d_m(j_l) = d_m(k_s) + m'$ and thus $K = |J_s| = 2^{m'-1}$. The new case inspection applies to the top cells of the rows $j_l \in J_s$:

(1): $\forall l \in [K] \ c_s \in U_{1,j_l}$

(2): $\exists l \in [K] \ c_s \notin U_{1,j_l}$

If Case (2) occurs with $c_s \notin U_{1,j_l}$ for a $j_l \in J_s$ then $c_s \notin U_{1,j}$ for all $j \in B(j_l)$ by condition (c) of the left-right rule. This immediately implies the precondition for the next stage with $k_{s+1} = j_l$ and $C_s = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_s\}$.

If Case (1) occurs, we consider the polygon P_s formed by the union of all cells $R_{i,j}$ with $j \in B_R(k_s)$ and $2 + (s - 1)m' \leq i \leq 1 + sm'$. As discussed above the cell decomposition of the polygon P_s is isomorphic to that of $S_{m'}$. Moreover extending the set G_s of original guards in P_s by pulling down all guards that sit directly above P_s onto the top edge of P_s , we obtain a cf-guarding of P_s with $t - 1$ colors, because c_s can't occur as a color in the extended guard set G_s^+ . This contradicts the inductive assumption and finishes the proof. $\blacktriangleleft$

Any attempt to adapt this proof to cf-guardings of S_m with respect to line visibility encounters the following problems.

Problem 1: It is impossible to subdivide the polygon into a finite set of visibility cells such that any two points in a cell would have the same visibility polygon.

Solution: The guard set watching a given cell $R_{i,j}$ is replaced by the guard set watching a single special point in the cell. We always choose the midpoint $p_{i,j}$ of the lower side of $R_{i,j}$.

Problem 2: Guards from the left wing of a column k can possibly see points in the right wing that are much deeper than $d_m(k)$.

Solution: The heights of rows in S_m will be stretched in an appropriate way such that no guard from the left wing of a column k can see a special point $p_{i,j}$ with $j \in B_R(k)$ and

$i > d_m(k)$.

Problem 3: A guard that sits deeper than $d_m(k)$ in $B_L(k)$ can possibly watch points in column k and even points in $B_R(k)$.

Solution: One can't avoid this, but the stretching of rows will assure that it won't see points in $B_{RR}(k)$. It turns out that the left-right rule must be relaxed in such a way that conditions (a), (b) and (c) do not hold in whole opposite half block, but they hold (in slightly modified form) at least in a quarter subblock. Formally we will refer to this fact by a quantified formula of the type $\exists_{XY \in \{LL, LR, RL, RR\}} \forall_{j \in B_{XY}} \dots$.

Problem 4: Pulling a guard to another position like in the construction of the guard set G_1^+ for the subpolygon P_1 changes the visibility range of the guards and might result in a guard set that does not cover the same subpolygon it covered before.

Solution: Any conflict-free guarding of S_m will be translated into purely combinatorial properties of the corresponding multicolor tableau, such that concrete guard positions don't play any role in the subsequent lower bound proof.

4.3 Stretched spike polygons and t -conform tableaux

For the purpose of forcing similar properties for l-visibility as we used for r-visibility we introduce a vertically stretched version $S_m^\downarrow$ of S_m with the following geometric properties:

- The width of each column is 1 and hence the total width of $S_m^\downarrow$ is $2^m - 1$.
- We distinguish between combinatorial and geometric depth of a column: While $d_m(k) = m - \pi_2(k)$ is still used for the combinatorial depth, we want the geometric depth to be $d_m^\downarrow(k) = 2^{(d_m(k)-1)m}$. Therefore the height of the first row is $h_1 = 1$ and the height of the i -th row $h_i = 2^{im} - 2^{(i-1)m}$.

Consider the decomposition of $S_m^\downarrow$ into r-visibility cells $R_{i,k}$ and let $p_{i,k}$ be the midpoint at the bottom side of $R_{i,k}$. If $\gamma : G \rightarrow [t]$ for guard set G is a conflict-free l-guarding of $S_m^\downarrow$, then let $M_{i,k}^\downarrow$ be the multiset of all colors of guards that see $p_{i,k}$ and $\mathcal{M}^\downarrow(\gamma) = \{M_{i,k}^\downarrow \mid k \in [2^m - 1], i \in [d_m(k)]\}$ the corresponding multicolor tableau.

The following two observations establish similarities between l-visibility in $S_m^\downarrow$ and r-visibility in S_m and substitute Lemmata 4.2 and 4.3.

► **Lemma 4.6.** *Let g be a guard in $S_m^\downarrow$, k a column of this polygon with combinatorial depth $d = d_m(k)$ and geometric depth $d_m^\downarrow(k) = 2^{(d-1)m}$. If $g \in W_R(k)$ ($g \in W_L(k)$) then g can't see any point p at depth $d^\downarrow(p) \geq 2^{dm}$ in the left (right) block of k , especially g can't see any point $p_{i,j}$ with $j \in B_L(k)$ ($j \in B_R(k)$) and $i > d$.*

Proof. By symmetry it is sufficient to study the first case with $g \in W_R(k)$, $d^\downarrow(p) \geq 2^{dm}$ and p a point in the subpolygon $B_L(k)$. Let q_L be the left vertex of the horizontal polygon edge in column k and consider the slopes s_1 and s_2 of the lines $\overline{pq_L}$ and $\overline{q_Lg}$. Since the width of $B_L(k)$ is $2^{m-d} - 1$ and $d^\downarrow(p) - d^\downarrow(q_L) \geq 2^{dm} - 2^{(d-1)m} = (2^m - 1) \cdot 2^{(d-1)m}$ we get

$$s_1 \geq \frac{(2^m - 1) \cdot 2^{(d-1)m}}{2^{m-d} - 1} = \frac{(2^m - 1) \cdot 2^{(d-1)m}}{2^{-d}(2^m - 2^d)} > \frac{2^{(d-1)m}}{2^{-d}} = 2^{(d-1)m+d}$$

Since g is in the right wing of k it is at least one half unit right of q_L and it is at most $d_m^\downarrow(k) = 2^{(d-1)m}$ higher than q_L

$$s_2 \leq \frac{2^{(k-1)m}}{1/2} = 2^{(d-1)m+1} \leq 2^{(d-1)m+d}$$

Thus, $s_1 > s_2$ what shows that the corner at q_L blocks the l-visibility between $p_{i,j}$ and g . ◀

► **Lemma 4.7.** *Let g be an l -guard watching a point $p_{i,k} \in S_m^\downarrow$. Then for all $i' \leq i$ and for all $j \in B_L(k)$ or for all $j \in B_R(k)$ g sees also $p_{i',j}$.*

Proof. Let $d^\downarrow(g)$ be the geometric depth of g in $S_m^\downarrow$.

Case 1: If g is even an r -guard for $p_{i,k}$ the claim follows for all $j \in B(k)$ by Lemma 4.2. Otherwise there are two more cases, namely that $d^\downarrow(g)$ is strictly smaller or strictly larger than $2^{(i-1)m}$ (see Figure 9).

Case 2: $d^\downarrow(g) < 2^{(i-1)m}$, i.e., g sees $p_{i,k}$ from above. If $g \in W_R(k)$ then g can see all $p_{i,j}$ with $j \in B_L(k)$ because the line segments $p_{i,j}p_{i,k}$ and $p_{i,k}g$ are contained in $S_m^\downarrow$ and they form a chain that is convex from above. If $g \in W_L(k)$ then g can see all $p_{i,j}$ with $j \in B_R(k)$ because the line segments $gp_{i,k}$ and $p_{i,k}p_{i,j}$ are contained in $S_m^\downarrow$ and they form a chain that is convex from above. Moreover it is clear that in $S_m^\downarrow$ any guard that sees a point $p_{i,j}$ will see also all points directly above, especially the points $p_{i',j}$ with $i' < i$.

Case 3: $d^\downarrow(g) > 2^{(i-1)m}$, i.e. g sees $p_{i,k}$ from below. Since $d^\downarrow(g) \leq d_m^\downarrow(k)$ would imply case 1, we can additionally assume $d^\downarrow(g) > d_m^\downarrow(k)$, i.e. g is in a cell $R_{i',j'}$ with $i' \geq d_m(k)$ and $j' \in B_L(k)$ or $j' \in B_R(k)$. Now we can apply Lemma 4.6 with $p_{i,k}$ in the role of the guard g and g in the role of a point p watched by g . It turns out that $d^\downarrow(g) < 2^{d_m(k)m}$, i.e., g lies in row $d_m(k) + 1$ of $S_m^\downarrow$. It follows that depending whether g lies in $B_L(k)$ or $B_R(k)$ it sees all $p_{i,j}$ with $j \in B_L(k)$ or $j \in B_R(k)$ (and all points directly above as well). ◀

A tableau $\mathcal{M}^\downarrow(\gamma)$ is in standard form if it has m rows and $N = 2^m - 1$ columns. But by various constructions, for example restricting it to a single block, one creates a tableau having m rows and $N' = 2^{m'} - 1$ columns for some $m' < m$. The following definition of t -conformity specifies some necessary, but not sufficient conditions a multicolor tableau has if it stems from a conflict-free t -coloring of a stretched spike polygon. The advantage is that t -conformity is preserved when acting on the tableau with operations defined below.

► **Definition 4.8.** Let $m' \leq m$ be natural numbers and $N' = 2^{m'} - 1$. A scheme of multisets over the set $[t]$ of the form $\mathcal{M} = (M_{i,k} \mid k \in [N'], i \in [d_m(k)])$ is called a t -conform $(m \times N')$ -multicolor tableau if the following properties hold:


1. $\forall k \in [N'] \quad \forall i \in [d_m(k)] \quad U_{i,k} \neq \emptyset$.
2. $\forall k \in [N'] \quad \forall 1 \leq i' \leq d_m(k) \quad M_{i',k} \subseteq M_{i,k}$.
3. $\forall k \in [N'] \quad \forall i \in [d_m(k)] \quad \forall c \in U_{i,k} \quad \exists XY \in \{LL, LR, RL, RR\} \quad \forall j \in B_{XY}(k) \quad Q(c, k, j)$
where the predicate $Q(c, k, j)$ is the conjunction of three conditions:
 - a. $c \in M_{i,j}$
 - b. $c \in U_{i,j} \rightarrow c \notin M_{d_m(k)+2,j}$
 - c. $c \notin U_{i,j} \rightarrow \exists Z \in \{L, R\} \quad \forall j' \in B_Z(j) \quad c \notin U_{d_m(k),j'}$.

Note the first two properties are identical with those in Proposition 4.4. The third one, however, is a proper relaxation of the left-right rule there. Thus, any tableau $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ resulting from a conflict-free r -guarding of S_m with t colors is also t -conform.

► **Proposition 4.9.** *The multicolor tableau $\mathcal{M}^\downarrow(\gamma)$ for a conflict-free l -guarding of the polygon $S_m^\downarrow$ with t colors is t -conform.*

Proof. There is nothing to prove for the uniqueness condition and for the monotonicity. Now let us assume $c \in U_{i,k}$ with a corresponding guard g . By symmetry we may suppose $g \in W_R(k)$. Like in Lemma 4.7 there are three cases to distinguish (see Figure 9):

1. $p_{i,k}$ is r -visible from g .
2. $p_{i,k}$ is not r -visible from g and $p_{i,k}$ is deeper than g .
3. $p_{i,k}$ is not r -visible from g and g is deeper than $p_{i,k}$.



■ **Figure 9** Possible guard positions with respect to the point $p_{i,k}$. Note that it is impossible to display the exponential growth of the row heights in the drawing.

In Case 1 and Case 2 we choose $XY = LL$ (but $XY = LR$ would also work - the gray points). In Case 3 the choice depends on the position of g relative to the central column $r(k)$ of the block $B_R(k)$:

$$XY = \begin{cases} RL & \text{if } g \in W_R(r(k)) \\ RR & \text{if } g \in W_L(r(k)). \end{cases}$$

It remains to establish the three conditions of $Q(c, k, j)$ for all $j \in B_{XY}(k)$. Condition (a) is obvious in case 1 and case 2. In case 3 it follows from the fact that g can't be deeper than $d_m^\perp(r(k))$ (see Case 3 in the proof of Lemma 4.7).

For condition (b) suppose that $c \in U_{i,j}$. This implies that g is the only guard with color c that sees $p_{i,j}$. However in all three cases g is in the wing opposite to block $B_{XY}(k)$ and then g can't see any point of combinatorial depth $d_m(k) + 2$ in $B_{XY}(k)$ by Lemma 4.6. It's worth observing that depth $d_m(k) + 1 = d_m(r(k))$ would not suffice in case 3. However, any other guard with color c watching $p_{d_m(k)+2,j}$ would also watch $p_{i,j}$ and contradicts the uniqueness of g . Thus $c \notin M_{d_m(k)+2,j}$.

Finally, let us suppose $c \notin U_{i,j}$, then there is a second guard g' for $p_{i,j}$. Now we can conclude from Lemma 4.7 that g' watches all points $p_{i,j'}$ for $j' \in B_L(j)$ or for all $j' \in B_R(j)$. This proves condition (c). ◀

► **Proposition 4.10.** *If $\mathcal{M} = (M_{i,k} \mid k \in [N'], i \in [d_m(k)])$ is a t -conform $(m \times N')$ -multicolor tableau with $N' = 2^{m'} - 1$ for some $m' \leq m$. Then the following three constructions yield new t -conform tableaux $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \mathcal{M}_3$:*

1. $\mathcal{M}_1$ is the restriction of $\mathcal{M}$ to a block $B(k)$;
2. $\mathcal{M}_2$ results from deleting the top $m - m'$ rows of $\mathcal{M}$;
3. $\mathcal{M}_3$ results from selecting $2^{m^*} - 1$ columns for some $m^* < m'$ with respect to the following rules:
 - For all even $k \in [2^{m^*} - 1]$ choose column $k \cdot 2^{m' - m^*}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ as column k of $\mathcal{M}_3$.
 - For all odd $k \in [2^{m^*} - 1]$ choose any column j of $\mathcal{M}$ with $(k - 1) \cdot 2^{m' - m^*} < j < (k + 1) \cdot 2^{m' - m^*}$, delete from that column all entries of depth $d > m^* + m - m'$ and use this truncated column as column k of $\mathcal{M}_3$.

Proof. Recall, the width of $B(k)$ is $N^* = 2^{m^*} - 1$ where $m^* = 2\pi_2(k)$. So the only thing that has to do for $\mathcal{M}_1$ is shifting the column numbering from the interval $B(k) =$

$[k - 2\pi_2(k) + 1, k + 2\pi_2(k) - 1]$ to $[N^*]$. Then $\mathcal{M}_1$ is t -conform.

For the second construction it is sufficient to shift down the indices of all undeleted rows by $m - m'$. Then $\mathcal{M}_2$ is an $m' \times N'$ tableau. Note that an old row index $d_m(k) = m - \pi_2(k)$ becomes $d_{m'}(k)$. Having that in mind, it is also trivial that $\mathcal{M}_2$ is t -conform.

The construction of $\mathcal{M}_3$ already contains the renumbering of indices. Again, it is not hard to conclude the t -conformity because the construction inherits the relations of being a column in the left (or right) subblock of another column. $\blacktriangleleft$

► **Theorem 4.11.** $\chi_{cf}^l(n) \in \Omega\left(\frac{\log \log n}{\log \log \log n}\right)$.

Proof. Despite similarities to the proof of Theorem 4.5 some essential modifications have to be implemented. The function $m(t)$ is now defined by $m(1) = 3$ and $m(t) = 1 + t \cdot (m(t-1) + 1)$ for $t \geq 2$.

Claim: An $m(t) \times (2^{m(t)} - 1)$ -tableau cannot be t -conform.

The inequality $m(t) \leq (t+1)!$ is no longer valid in general, but, it still holds for all $t \geq 5$. In fact, $m(5) = 651 < 720 = (5+1)!$ and the induction step works for any $t \geq 6$ as follows:
 $m(t) = t \cdot (m(t-1) + 1) + 1 \leq t(t! + 1) + 1 = t \cdot t! + (t+1) \leq t \cdot t! + t! = (t+1)!$

Hence using Proposition 4.9 one can then deduce the theorem from the claim like before.

In the proof of the claim by induction on t the induction base for $t = 1$ works with similar arguments as before. Any 1-conform 3×7 tableau requires to set $U_{i,k} = \{1\}$ for all $k \in [7]$ and all $i \in [d_3(k)]$. However, applying property 3 to the situation $1 \in U_{1,4}$ yields a contradiction with condition (c).

The induction step is proved by contradiction again. Assume that there are no $(t-1)$ -conform $m' \times N'$ -tableaux with $m' = m(t-1)$ and $N' = 2^{m'} - 1$, but there is a t -conform $m \times N$ -tableau $\mathcal{M}$ for $m = m(t)$ and $N = 2^m - 1$. The proof consists of $s \leq t$ stages. The precondition of stage s is the existence of a t -conform $m \times N_{s-1}$ -tableau where $N_{s-1} = 2^{m-(s-1)(m'+1)} - 1$ and the additional property that there is a set $C_{s-1} \subset [t]$ consisting of $s-1$ colors, such that for all $c \in C_{s-1}$ and for all $k \in [N_s]$ holds $c \notin U_{1,k}$. The precondition for the first stage is given by $\mathcal{M}$ with $N_0 = N$ and $C_0 = \emptyset$, but $\mathcal{M}$ will change after every stage. The postcondition of the s -th stage is either a contradiction obtained by constructing a $(t-1)$ -conform $m' \times N'$ -tableau (the stop condition, case 1) or the creation of the precondition for the next step (case 2). Note that if the stop condition did not occur after the t -th stage, then the new precondition gives also a contradiction because $C_t = [t]$ and $N_t = 2^1 - 1 = 1$, i.e., it would result in a t -conform $m \times 1$ -tableau (a single column) such that no color can be unique in $M_{1,1}$.

Now suppose that an $m \times N_{s-1}$ -tableau $\mathcal{M}$ with a color set C_{s-1} fulfills the precondition for stage s with $1 \leq s \leq t$. Let $k = \frac{N_{s-1}+1}{2}$ be the central column of $\mathcal{M}$ and $c_s \in U_{1,k}$. Note that the precondition implies $c_s \notin C_{s-1}$. Then by property 3 of t -conform tableaux there is some $XY \in \{LL, LR, RL, RR\}$ such that predicate $Q(c_s, k, j)$ is true for all $j \in B_{XY}(k)$. Again we subdivide the block $B_{XY}(k)$ into $K = 2^{m'-1}$ subblocks of equal width. These subblocks can be defined by their central columns j_l where $l \in [K]$. Note that their width just fits to the precondition of the next stage because $B_{XY}(k)$ has width $\frac{N_{s-1}+1}{4} - 1$ and consequently all $B(j_l)$ have width:

$$\frac{N_{s-1} + 1}{4 \cdot 2^{m'-1}} - 1 = \frac{2^{m-(s-1)(m'+1)}}{4 \cdot 2^{m'-1}} - 1 = \frac{2^{m-(s-1)(m'+1)}}{2^{m'+1}} - 1 = 2^{m-s(m'+1)} - 1$$

Due to the weaker conditions encoded in predicate $Q(c, k, j)$ we have to modify the case inspection:

(1) $\forall l \in [K] \exists j' \in B(j_l) c_s \in U_{1,j'}$

(2) $\exists_{l \in [K]} \forall_{j' \in B(j_l)} c_s \notin U_{1,j'}$

In Case 1 we can immediately derive a contradiction using the constructions of Proposition 4.10: First we restrict (the current) $\mathcal{M}$ to the block $B_{XY}(k)$, then we use the column selection with $m^* = m'$ where the even columns (numbered $2l$ for $l \in [K]$) of the new tableau are the ones that separate the subblocks B_{j_l} and $B_{j_{l+1}}$ from each other and the odd columns $2l - 1$ are chosen from B_{j_l} with respect to the property $c_s \in U_{1,j'}$. Supposing that c_s is not unique in the top set of an even column would contradict condition (c) of predicate $Q(c_s, k, j)$. Thus c_s is unique everywhere in the first row of the new tableau and with respect to condition (b) it does not occur at all in third row or deeper. Each column of this new tableau $\mathcal{M}'$ has depth $d \geq 3$ because all columns of $\mathcal{M}'$ had been selected from a quarter subblock $B_{XY}(k)$. Now we apply construction 2 (deletion of top rows) to $\mathcal{M}'$ to obtain an $m' \times N'$ -tableau $\mathcal{M}^*$. This way at least the two top rows of $\mathcal{M}'$ are deleted and thus color c_s doesn't occur anymore in $\mathcal{M}^*$. Finally, we can replace color t by color c_s to obtain a $(t - 1)$ -conform $m' \times N'$ -tableau.

Case 2 is now the easier one because replacing $\mathcal{M}$ by a block $B(j_l)$ such that $\forall_{j' \in B(j_l)} c_s \notin U_{1,j'}$ (construction 1) yields the precondition for the next stage with $C_s = C_{s-1} \cup \{c_s\}$. ◀

5 Conclusions

We have shown almost tight bounds for the chromatic AGP for orthogonal simple polygons if based on r-visibility. While the upper bound proofs use known techniques, we consider the multicolor tableau method for the lower bounds to be the main technical contribution of our paper. This method seems to be unnecessarily complicated for the lower bound on $\chi_{cf}^r(n)$. But it shows its strength when applied to the line visibility case. It is this discrete structure which enables one to apply induction. Otherwise we would not know how to show a lower bound for a continuum of possible guard positions with strange dependencies plus all possible colorings.

We conjecture that indeed $\chi_{cf}^r(n) \in \Omega(\log \log n)$ using spike polygons and this should also yield a $\log \log n$ lower bound for the line visibility case via the stretched version. But one cannot hope for more, $\log \log n$ is also an upper bound for cf-guarding of stretched spike polygons using line visibility. To improve this lower bound one has to look for other polygons.

References

- 1 A. Bartschi and S. Suri. Conflict-free Chromatic Art Gallery Coverage. *Algorithmica* 68(1): 265–283, 2014.
- 2 A. Bartschi, S.K. Ghosh, M. Mihalak, T. Tschager, and P. Widmayer. Improved bounds for the conflict-free chromatic art gallery problem. In *Proc. of 30th Symposium on Computational Geometry*, pages 144–153, 2014.
- 3 V. Chvátal. A combinatorial theorem in plane geometry. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 18(1):39–41, 1975.
- 4 L. H. Erickson und S. M. LaValle. An Art Gallery Approach to Ensuring that Landmarks are Distinguishable. In *Proc. Robotics: Science and Systems VII*, Los Angeles, pages 81–88, 2011.
- 5 S. Fisk. A short proof of Chvátal's Watchman Theorem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 24(3):374–374, 1978.
- 6 S. P. Fekete, S. Friedrichs, and M. Hemmer. Complexity of the General Chromatic Art Gallery Problem. *arXiv 1403.2972[cs.CG]*, 2014.

- 7 F. Hoffmann, On the Rectilinear Art Gallery Problem, Proc. 17th ICALP, Springer LNCS 443, 717-728, 1990.
- 8 R. Motwani, A. Raghunathan and H. Saran. Covering orthogonal polygons with star polygons: The perfect graph approach. Comput. Syst. Sci. 40 (1990) 19-48.
- 9 J. O'Rourke. Art Gallery Theorems and Algorithms. Oxford University Press, New York, NY, 1987.
- 10 J. Pach G. Tardos. Coloring axis-parallel rectangles. J. Comb. Theory Ser. A, 117(6):776–782, Aug 2010.
- 11 T. Shermer. Recent results in art galleries (geometry). Proceedings of the IEEE, 80(9): 1383–1399, September 1992.
- 12 S. Smorodinski. Conflict-Free Coloring and its Applications. In Geometry - Intuitive, Discrete, and Convex, volume 24 of Bolyai Society Mathematical Studies, Springer Verlag, Berlin 2014.
- 13 J. Urrutia. Art gallery and illumination problems, in J.-R. Sack and J. Urrutia, editors, Handbook on Computational Geometry, pages 973–1026, Elsevier Sc. Publishers, 2000.
- 14 M. Willert. Schranken für eine orthogonale Variante des chromatischen Art Gallery Problems, Bachelor Thesis, FU Berlin, November 2014.
- 15 C. Worman, M. Keil. Polygon Decomposition and the Orthogonal Art Gallery Problem, Int. J. Comput. Geometry Appl. 17(2):105–138, 2007.